

GP 2754

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



RECEIVED  
FEB 18 2000  
TC 2700 MAIL ROOM

Applicant: Dovek et al.  
Assignee: Maxtor Corporation  
Title: MAGNETIC STORAGE DEVICE WITH FLUX-GUIDED PERPENDICULAR MAGNETORESISTIVE HEAD USING A PERPENDICULAR RECORDING MEDIA (AS AMENDED)

Serial No.: 09/067,795 Filed: April 28, 1998  
Examiner: Korzuch, W. Group Art Unit: 2754  
Atty. Docket No.: 3123-276

a/elect  
2/22/00  
OK

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated January 21, 2000, please consider the following remarks.

**I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

In the Office Action dated October 12, 1999, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement grouping claims 1-60 as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-16, 18, 19, 21-29, 31-33 and 42-60.

Group II: Claims 20 and 34-41.

In sustaining the restriction requirement, the Examiner stated that Group I is drawn to a flux-guided magnetoresistive head, Group II is drawn to details of the read circuitry, and claims 17 and 30 are linking claims.

In Applicant's Response dated November 9, 1999, Applicant provisionally elected Group I but traversed the restriction requirement for several reasons and requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner states that "In view of the amendment filed on November 15, 1999, the restriction requirement has been amended as follows." However, the remainder of the outstanding Office Action appears to be exactly the same as the previous restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action dated October 12, 1999. For instance, Group I is directed to claims 1-16, 18, 19, 21-29, 31-33 and 42-60, Group II is directed to claims 20 and 34-41, and no group is provided for claims 17 and 30. Thus, it is not understood how the restriction requirement has been amended. Furthermore, the outstanding Office Action advises that Applicant's reply must include an election of the invention to be examined. This is also not understood since, as mentioned above, Applicant provisionally elected Group I with traverse in the Response dated November 9, 1999. Applicant would appreciate any clarification.

At any rate, for the reasons set forth in the Response dated November 9, 1999, Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

## **II. CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS**

Applicant filed a Change of Correspondence Address with the Response dated June 18, 1999. However, both the Office Action dated October 12, 1999, and the outstanding Office Action were sent to the previous correspondence address. As requested in the Response dated November 9, 1999, Applicant requests that future correspondence be sent to the new correspondence address.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on February 4, 2000.

*D Sigmond*

David M. Sigmond  
Attorney for Applicant

*2 / 4 / 00*

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

*D Sigmond*

David M. Sigmond  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,013  
(303) 702-4132  
(303) 678-3111 (fax)